



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,419	05/15/2006	Jozef Pieter Van Gassel	NL 031339	7897

24737 7590 04/17/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

KAYRISH, MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/579,419	Applicant(s) VAN GASSEL, JOZEF PIETER	
	Examiner MATTHEW G. KAYRISH	Art Unit 2627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The sub-titles within the disclosure are missing. The application should contain these sub-titles because this makes understanding the present application easier and helps to distinguish between the background, summary, drawings and the disclosure.

The examiner recommends the sub-title "Background of Prior Art" inserted before page 1, line 1 of the specification.

The examiner recommends the sub-title "Summary of the Invention" inserted before page 2, line 25 of the specification.

The examiner recommends the sub-title "Brief Description of the Drawings" inserted before page 4, line 30 of the specification.

The examiner recommends the sub-title "Disclosure of the Invention" inserted before page 5, line 12 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

They contain reference characters which refer back to the reference characters in the disclosure of the invention, however, this does not further limit the claim.

4. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Specifically, claim 6 depends from claim 4, however claim 5 depends from claim 3 and separates claim 6 from claim 4. The examiner recommends that claim 5 be interchanged with claim 4 or claim 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wu (US Patent Number 6865627).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Wu discloses:

A playback device (figure 1, item 176) for playback of a media stream from a storage medium (column 6, lines 17-21), the device comprising reading means for reading at least a part of the media stream (column 4, lines 23-49), a buffer (figure 2, item 210) for holding the part of the media stream (columns 6 & 7, lines 61-67 & 1-12), a playback unit (figure 2, item 204) for consuming the part of the media stream from the buffer (column 6, lines 61-67) at a predefined rate (column 7, lines 13-25), and control means for controlling the reading of the media stream from the storage medium (column 7, lines 13-25), filling of the buffer and the playback of the media stream (columns 6 & 7, lines 61-67 & 1-12), which control means comprise means for retrieving playback mode control information (column 7, lines 26-54), and means for calculating a buffer refilling time depending on the playback mode control information (column 7, lines 26-54).

Regarding claim 2, Wu discloses the features of base claim 1, as stated in the 102 rejection above, and further discloses:

Wherein the means for retrieving playback mode control information are arranged for retrieving characteristic point information (columns 9 & 10, lines 43-67 & 1-13; figure3) and the means for calculating the buffer refilling time are arranged for calculating the buffer refilling time depending on the characteristic point information (column 7, lines 26-54).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Wu discloses the features of base claim 1, as stated in the 102 rejection above, and further discloses:

The control means are arranged for calculating the buffer filling period depending on information concerning retrieval of the media stream (columns 6 & 8, lines 17-46 & 54-60).

Regarding claim 5, Wu discloses the features of base claim 3, as stated in the 102 rejection above, and further discloses:

The control means are arranged for calculating the buffer filling period depending on information from the file system info (columns 6 & 8, lines 17-46 & 54-60).

Regarding claim 10, Wu discloses the features of base claim 8, as stated in the 102 rejection above, and further discloses:

A computer program product which program is operative to cause a processor to perform the method (abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Jacobs et al (US Patent Number 5802032).

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Wu discloses the features of base claim 3, as stated in the 102 rejection above, but fail to specifically disclose:

The control means are arranged for calculating the buffer filling period depending on information about the location of the part of the media stream on the storage medium.

Jacobs discloses:

A playback device (figure 5) for playback of a media stream from a storage medium (column 8, lines 36-43), the device comprising reading means for reading at least a part of the media stream (figure 4, item 4), a playback unit for consuming the part of the media stream (column 1, lines 10-33) at a predefined rate (column 8, lines 44-67);

A control means are arranged for calculating the frequency of the data signal (column 8, lines 43-67) depending on information about the location of the part of the media stream on the storage medium (column 8, lines 43-67).

A control means arranged for calculating the frequency of the data signal depending on information about the position of a disk head (column 8, lines 43-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the radial position of the head to calculate the refill time of the buffer of Wu, as suggested by Jacobs, because for a constant angular velocity and pulse width, it is inherent that a larger radial position will increase the frequency of the data signal, therefore, the refill time will decrease with increase of radius of the head position.

9. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu.

Regarding claim 7, Wu discloses the features of base claim 1, as stated in the 102 rejection above, but fail to specifically disclose:

The control means are arranged for turning the device in a low power consuming mode for a time interval depending on the buffer refilling time.

Official notice is taken that the low power consuming mode naturally flows from the play-pause mode. Specifically, Wu states that when the output data queue is full, the data source is instructed not to send any new data, as stated in column 9, lines 33-43.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made turn the device to a power save mode when new data is not being sent, as implied by Wu, because this will save power.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW G. KAYRISH whose telephone number is (571)272-4220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew G. Kayrish /Matthew G. Kayrish/ 4/11/2008
/M. G. K./

Examiner, Art Unit 2627

/Brian E. Miller/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627